

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

7 \* \* \*

8 THE BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 INSPIRADA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION,  
12 *et al.*,

13 Defendants.  
14

Case No. 2:16-cv-000673-KJD-CWH

ORDER

15 **I. Background and Analysis**

16 This case emerges from the non-judicial foreclosure sale by Defendant Inspirada  
17 Community Association on or about August 22, 2013 of the property located at 233 Via  
18 Seranova, Henderson, Nevada 89044 (“the Property”). This case shares a similar fact pattern  
19 with many cases currently pending before this Court, all having to do with HOA foreclosure  
20 sales. One of the issues before the Court centers in whole or in part around the question of what  
21 notice of default the foreclosing party was required to provide Plaintiff prior to its foreclosure  
22 sale on the Property. After the Nevada Supreme Court’s decision in SFR Invs. Pool 1, LLC v.  
23 U.S. Bank, the Ninth Circuit decided Bourne Valley Court Trust v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA, 832  
24 F.3d 1154, 1160 (9th Cir. 2016) (holding NRS 115.3116(2)’s statutory notice scheme was  
25 facially unconstitutional).

26 On April 21, 2017, in Bank of New York Mellon v. Star Hills Homeowners Ass’n, this  
27 Court certified the following question to the Nevada Supreme Court: “Whether NRS §  
28 116.31168(1)’s incorporation of NRS § 107.090 requires homeowners associations to provide

1 notices of default to banks even when a bank does not request notice?” Bank of New York  
2 Mellon v. Star Hill Homeowners Ass’n, 2017 WL 1439671, at \*5 (D. Nev. April 21, 2017).

3 In granting certification, the Court reasoned the following: In Bourne Valley, the Ninth  
4 Circuit definitively answered the question that the statute’s “opt-in” framework was  
5 unconstitutional. Bourne Valley Court Trust v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA, 832 F.3d 1154, 1160 (9th  
6 Cir. 2016). However, that left the Court with the unresolved question of what notice must be  
7 provided. “It is solely within the province of the state courts to authoritatively construe state  
8 legislation.” Cal. Teachers Ass’n v. State Bd. of Educ., 271 F.3d 1141, 1146 (9th Cir. 2001). As  
9 such, state law questions of first impression like this one should be resolved by the state’s  
10 highest court. See Huddleston v. Dwyer, 322 U.S. 232, 237 (1944).

11 On August 2, 2018, the Supreme Court of Nevada answered the certified question. See  
12 SFR Invs. Pool 1, LLC v. Bank of New York Mellon, 422 P.3d 1248 (Nev. 2018). Further, it has  
13 since issued two new opinions that bear on the issues in this action. See Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.  
14 v. Tim Radecki, 2018 WL 4402403 (Nev. September 13, 2018); Bank of America, N.A. v. SFR  
15 Invs. Pool 1, LLC, 2018 WL 4403296 (Nev. September 13, 2018) (tender of the superpriority  
16 amount prior to foreclosure results in buyer taking property subject to deed of trust).

17 Additionally, opinions in several cases have directly addressed the Federal Foreclosure  
18 Bar issues in this action. See Berezovsky v. Moniz, 869 F.3d 923 (9th Cir. 2017); Elmer v.  
19 JPMorgan Chase & Co., 707 Fed. Appx. 426 (9th Cir. 2017); Nationstar Mortg., LLC v. SFR  
20 Invs. Pool 1, LLC, 396 P.3d 754 (Nev. 2017).

### 21 **A. Stay of the Case**

22 A district court has the inherent power to stay cases to control its docket and promote the  
23 efficient use of judicial resources. Landis v. North Am. Co., 299 U.S., 248, 254-55 (1936);  
24 Dependable Highway Exp., Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co., 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 200). A  
25 stay is no longer necessary in this action where the certified question has already been decided.

### 26 **B. Briefing Schedule**

27 The parties may either file a stipulation or move the Court for a modified discovery plan  
28 and scheduling order as necessary. If the parties fail to do so, dispositive motions are due no later


1 than forty-five (45) days after the entry of this order. Any future dispositive motions must  
2 address the most recent case law applicable to the issues in this action.

3 **II. Conclusion**

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the stay in this action is lifted;

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that stipulations, motions to modify the discovery plan and  
6 scheduling order, or in the absence of such stipulations or motions, dispositive motions are due  
7 within forty-five (45) days after the entry of this order.

8 Dated this 19th day of October, 2018.

9  
10 

11 Kent J. Dawson  
12 United States District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28